



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE. Vol. XIX.

No. 1.

1. Pp. 1-10. Philippe Fabia discusses the question whether the works of Tacitus were favorably received by his contemporaries, and arrives at an affirmative conclusion. He admits that the favorable mention of Tacitus's works by Pliny does not prove that they were successful, but he finds other reasons for the belief that they were. These reasons are not new as facts, but consist in a skilful manipulation of facts already known. [Rather remarkable is the following footnote (on Ann. IV 32 Pleraque . . . parva forsitan et levia memoratu videri non nescius sum): "Notons bien que Tacite dit *videri* et non *visura esse*. Il songe aux lecteurs et aux auditeurs contemporains." What would *visura esse* mean?]

2. Pp. 11-19. P. Couvreur discusses the *σφόνδυλοι*, composing the *σφόνδυλος* of the *Ἀνάγκης ἀτρακτος* in the myth of Er, as given in Plat. Rep. X 616 f., and quoted by Theon of Smyrna, Astron. 16. Couvreur demonstrates that the general *σφόνδυλος* was not a sphere but a circular disc, possibly somewhat curved on one side, and the different *σφόνδυλοι* were hollow discs fitting into each other like some of our weights. The article treats several other points. [It seems surprising that, as he says, "Interprètes et traducteurs ont vu des *sphères* là où il n'y a que des *cercles*"; and again: "Tous les interprètes ont représenté ce peson (*σφόνδυλος*) comme sphérique." In reading Plato I never conceived it any other way than as Couvreur describes it.]

3. Pp. 20-23. Remarks on passages of Horace and Cicero, by H. Weil.  
1) The difficulties of Ars Poetica, 251-62, are discussed, and the sense cleared by punctuating

Cum senos redderet ictus  
primus ad extremum similis sibi non ita pridem,  
tardior ut etc.

The Latin *pridem*, like *πάλαι*, may mean 'for a long time.' 2) In Cic. De Oratore, III 185, for *post anapaestus* read *postea paeonicus*.

4. Pp. 24-31. Critical notes, by P. Foucart, on Aristot. Rep. Ath. XLVIII, XLIX, LIV, LVII.

5. Pp. 32-5. J. Chauvin discusses Valerius Flaccus, Argon. I 420, and proposes "*celer aspera plumbo*."

6. Pp. 36 f. Éd. Tournier critically discusses Babr. XCVIII 4, 6, 9, 13, 17 ff.

7. Pp. 38-42. J. van der Vliet critically discusses six passages in Seneca, Suasoriae VI and VII.

8. Pp. 43 f. Éd. Tournier emends Ov. Met. VIII 667, 678, 679, 709.

9. Pp. 45-64. The grammarian Virgil and the Latin rhythms, by Paul Lejay. In his concluding general remarks the author says: "Un des éditeurs des poètes carolingiens se plaint, à la fin de sa tâche, de sortir tout meurtri et déchiré de ces buissons épineux, dépourvus de feuilles et de fleurs. Notre tâche n'a guère été moins pénible." The only fruit is: "Une étude un peu approfondie d'une des branches de l'enseignement et de la science à l'aube du VIIe siècle nous fait entrer dans la psychologie de ces âmes où la barbarie ambiante, la tradition scolastique, la curiosité naïve, la puérilité pédante se mêlaient étrangement." To those that desire to do this, this elaborate article is commended.

10. Pp. 65 f. G. Lafaye proposes *Torquatum* for *Coruinum* in Juv. VIII 7.

11. Pp. 67-9. P. Tannery reads, in Theon of Smyrna, p. 99, l. 13 ff. (Hiller), δὲ πρὸς τῷ εἰρημένῳ ὅρκῳ οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ ἐλεγον τὸ [καὶ] κτέ., and makes some interesting remarks.

12. Pp. 70-77. Aug. Audollent defends the genuineness of the greater part of the prologue of Plaut. Amphitryo. The article is of considerable interest to students of Plautus.

13. Pp. 78-104. Book Notices. 1) H. L. makes favorable mention of Otto Schwab, Historische Syntax der griechischen Comparison in der klassischen Litteratur (Beiträge u. s. w., v. Martin Schanz, fasc. 11). 2) Ph. E. Legrand summarizes and makes comments, not always favorable, on De Callimachi hymnis quaestiones chronologicae, scr. Bruno Ehrlich, Breslau, 1894. 3) F. C. commends G. R. Paton, Plutarchi Pythici dialogi tres, Berlin, 1893, and submits to the author some special observations. 4) F. Cumont describes and commends E. Nestle, A tract of Plutarch on the advantage to be derived from one's enemies, London, 1894, and adds some suggestions. 5) J. Keelhoff regrets to find that The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus, by R. C. Jebb, 2d ed., London, 1893, is little more than a reprint of the first edition. He points out several things in which he thinks changes should have been made. 6) L. Auvray et G. Goyau, Correspondance inédite de Gaetano Marini et Isidoro Bianchi, Rome, 1893. Mentioned by L. Duvau. This correspondence throws light upon classical bibliography of the period, and contains the text of some inscriptions not found in the Corpus. 7) L'Eau. Étude philologique par H. Daussy. Paris, 1894. Φ merely says: "M. Daussy connaît 'les sept langues qu'on enseigne dans nos lycées.' Que n'a-t-il appliqué ses connaissances à la lecture de quelque ouvrage élémentaire sur son sujet?" 8) L. D. describes H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, Études sur le droit celtique, Paris, 1894. He admires the author's ability to draw far-reaching inferences, but distrusts their correctness in some cases. 9) L. Duvau reviews two works together: W. Deecke, Lateinische Schulgrammatik (with Erläuterungen for teachers in a separate volume), Berlin, 1893; and Karl Schmidt, Lateinische Schulgrammatik, 8. umgearbeitete Aufl., unter Mitwirkung von O. Gehlen, Wien, 1894. Duvau finds the former work too full in the treatment of forms, too brief in its syntax and examples. He condemns Deecke's new terminology, and makes some very sensible remarks on the uselessness of changing technical

terminology. For instance: "Il n'y a pas grand mal à dire que *in horto* est un 'ablatif,' mais il est ridicule de dire que nous avons ici affaire au *Woherfall*." His estimate of the *Erläuterungen* is favorable. The grammar of Schmidt, which the reviewer says he has not examined thoroughly, seems to him to be more judiciously proportioned. 10) *Anthologia Latina sive poesis Latinae supplementum*, pars prior, carmina in codicibus scripta rec. Al. Riese, fasc. I, ed. altera, Lipsiae, 1894. G. Lafaye gives an account of this work, pointing out the important improvements over the first edition, and comparing it with the work of Baehrens. He concludes that "il est impossible à un éditeur de s'acquitter de sa tâche avec une méthode plus sûre; c'était par là que M. Riese devait reprendre l'avantage sur Baehrens et il y a pleinement réussi." 11) W. C. Summers, *A Study of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus*, Cambridge, 1894. G. Lafaye describes this work, and subjects it to a respectful but not uniformly favorable criticism. The work (76 pages) is intended only to supplement those of others. 12) *Grammatici Graeci recogniti et apparatus critico instructi partis quartae volumen posterius Choerobosci scholia in canones verbales et Sophronii excerpta e Characis commentario continens*. Rec. A. Hilgard. Leipzig, 1894. Briefly described and in the main commended by H. Lebègue. 12) Tacitus. *The Agricola and Germania* edited . . . by A. Grosvenor Hopkins, Boston, etc., 1893. Ph. Fabia describes this work and makes some adverse comments. "On ne peut pas dire que M. Hopkins soit tout à fait au courant des travaux relatifs à son double sujet; cependant ses notes sont très riches, en somme, et rendront de réels services à ceux pour qui elles sont faites." 13) *Selections from the Letters of the Younger Pliny*, edited by Samuel Ball Platner, Boston, etc., 1894. Mentioned by H. B., who says: "C'est un essai assez heureux, mais ce n'est pas la perfection." 14) *Lexique des antiquités romaines, rédigé sous la direction de R. Cagnat, . . . par G. Goyau . . . avec la collaboration de plusieurs élèves de l'École Normale supérieure, Paris*. H. L. finds this an excellent and useful work. He points out a few slight defects. 15) *La littérature latine jusqu'aux Antonins*, par Paul Thomas, Bruxelles. H. Bornecque, after a brief description, says: "L'ouvrage est parfait dans son genre, mais ce genre n'est pas sans défauts." He thinks it might well have inscribed upon it: *Indocti discant et ament meminsse periti*. 16) P. Siewert, *Plautus in Amphitruone fabula quomodo exemplar Graecum transtulerit*, Leipzig, 1894. Ch. Tailliart gives a brief analysis of the contents. The author's erudition is vast, but his conclusions hardly convincing. 17) Léopold Constans, *Étude sur la langue de Tacite*, Paris, 1893. Ph. Fabia praises this work highly, but regrets that it is not printed in more attractive style. 18) Max Neumann, *Eustathios als kritische Quelle für den Iliastext* (reprint from 20th Supplementband der Jahrbücher f. classische Philologie, pp. 145-340). Favorably mentioned by H. Lebègue. Eustathius had scarcely any resources not at our command. 19) *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*. No. IV. *The Athenian Constitution*, by G. W. Botsford, 1893. A. Martin commends this work on the whole, but calls attention to the author's neglect of all French works on the subject. 20) *Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides*. 2. *Iphigenie auf Tauris*, erklärt von F. G. Schöne und H. Köchly. 4. Aufl., neue Bearbeitung von E. Bruhn, Berlin, 1894. A. Martin pronounces this practically a new work, and one that would be excellent but for the

unfortunate disregard of the critical edition of Chr. Ziegler, 1873, 2d ed. 1884. 21) Tacitus' *Agricola* and *Germania*. With introduction and notes by H. M. Stephenson. Cambridge, 1894. Ph. Fabia finds this work in many respects like that of Hopkins, but not characterized by the same faults. He asks why S. has so carefully refrained from giving the names of the philologists who have thrown light upon some of the questions discussed. 22) Costantino Maes. *Saggio dell' intero Catalogo di centosei codici Greci della Biblioteca Angelica in Roma, totalmente descritti ed illustrati. Fascicolo primo*. Rome, 1894. L. Dorez says this work is a criticism of the librarian of the Angelica, with the catalogue of 12 MSS added at the end. The outcome promises to be two catalogues of the 100 MSS of the library. 23) Cebetis *tabula*, recensuit C. Prächter, Lipsiae, 1893. P. C. makes brief favorable mention. 24) Aeschylus *Fabulae cum lectionibus et scholiis codicis Medicei et in Agamemnonem codicis Florentini* ab H. Vitelli denuo collatis, edidit N. Wecklein. 2 vol. Berlin, 1893. Reviewed by A. Martin, who gives an account of the contents (fragments, scholia, critical apparatus, proposed corrections). The work, of course, is viewed favorably. 25) Dr. Otto Schulthess, *Bericht über die in den Jahren 1878-93 erschienene Litteratur zu den griechischen Staats- u. Rechtsaltertümern* (reprint from the *Jahresbericht über d. Fortschritte u. s. w.*). B. H. directs attention to this (as yet incomplete) report, and joins the author in urging all authors of works of any sort bearing on the subject to send copies to him (Dr. Otto Schulthess, Frauenfeld, Switzerland). 26) Fridericus Hueffner, *De Plauti comoediarum exemplis Atticis quaestiones maxime chronologicae*, Gottingae, 1894. Jules Chauvin pronounces this doctor-dissertation worthy of attention. He explains the author's method and sums up his results, which, he thinks, will in the main stand the test of criticism and further investigation. 27) Plutarchi *Chaeronensis Moralia recognovit Gregorius N. Bernardakis*. Vol. V. Leipzig, 1893. A. Martin gives a concise table of contents and history of the work of which this is part. He refers to adverse criticisms, especially those of Wilamowitz, and the author's reply in vol. II (preface). 28) Otto Morgenstern, *Curae Catullianae*, Berolini, 1894 (progr. gymn.). G. Lafaye commends the sober and respectful tone, and gives some samples of the textual criticism of the author, evincing method and penetration. 29) *Syriani in Hermogenem Commentaria*, edidit H. Rabe. Vol. II. Leipzig, 1893. P. C. makes brief but favorable mention. He finds the critical apparatus, however, confused and hard to consult. 30) Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen, VII. Band, 4. Heft: *De Hyla*, scr. G. Türk, Breslau, 1895. Ph. E. Legrand summarizes the work, which embraces all the documents and monuments relating to the Mysian god Hylas.

## No. 2.

1. Pp. 105-8. Jules Nicole describes and publishes the text of a page of Eur. *Orest.* (vv. 1062-90). Unfortunately the troublesome vv. 1086 f. are entirely obliterated. Elided *a* (except in *ἀλλ'* and *πάντ'*) is everywhere written. Nicole believes that this indicates a sort of synizesis rather than total elision, and to illustrate this view he refers to the famous *γαλήν' ὁρῶ* incident.

2. Pp. 109-15. Pausanias and the destruction of Haliartos by the Persians, by Maurice Holleaux. In this highly interesting article it is shown that Hali-

artos was not destroyed by the Persians, and that Pausanias in his references to that event (IX 32, 5; X 35, 2) was probably misled by some work in which he found mention of the destruction of Haliartos in the war of Perseus (ἐν τῷ Περσικῷ πολέμῳ, or something of the sort) in 171. The article contains some very interesting details.

3. P. 115. L. Havet proposes *af me* for *a me* and *af te* for *aps* (*ab*, *abs*) *te* in Plaut. Trinum. 969.

4. Pp. 116-18. Paul Tannery discusses the myth of Er (Plat. Rep. X 616 BC). He shows that the luminous column cannot be the Milky Way, and holds that the myth relates to the world of Ideas and that, consequently, none of its phenomena are to be sought in the visible world. He incidentally discusses the nature of the ὑποζώματα of triremes.

5. Pp. 119-22. P. Foucart discusses an Eleusinian inscription which records two victories of two joint *choregoi*, one victory being won *κωμῳδοῖς*, the other *τραγωδοῖς*. The *choregoi*, Γνάθης Τιμοκλήδους and Ἀναξανδρίδης Τιμαγόρον, are shown to have been Eleusinians, and the fact is pointed out that the tragic contest must have preceded the comic. At the former Σοφοκλῆς ἐδίδασκεν, at the latter Ἀριστοφάνης ἐδίδασκεν. The inscription confirms the Schol. on Ar. Ran. 401, who cites from Aristotle that in 406-5 σὺν δυνὶ ἔδοξε χορηγεῖν τὰ Διονύσια τοῖς τραγωδοῖς καὶ κωμῳδοῖς. It further shows that still at this date the *choregoi* for comedy were appointed by the archon, a fact interesting in connection with Aristot. Ἀθ. πολ. LVI 3 πρότερον δὲ καὶ κωμῳδοῖς καθίστηεν, νῦν δὲ τοῦτους αἱ φυλαὶ φέρουσιν. Foucart determines the very tragedy concerned and the year of the performance: it was the Oedipus Coloneus, produced in 401 by the younger Sophocles. The exact date of the comedy cannot be fixed. [The argument for the date of the tragedy seems unsound. As Sophocles died before the Dionysia in 406-5, he truly says, the Σοφοκλῆς of the inscription must be the grandson; therefore, he concludes, the play must have been the Oed. Col. But there is nothing in the inscription to imply that the play was by the elder Sophocles. The occasion might very well have been one of those on which the grandson won victories with plays of his own, as, for instance, in 396.]

6. P. 122. Éd. Tournier proposes *γενησόμενον* for *γενόμενον* in Hdt. I 108, βουλόμενος τὸ γενόμενον κτέ.

7. Pp. 123-8. Albert Martin publishes a collation of part of the celebrated MS of Isocrates, Urbinas CXI, in the Vatican. He had already published a description and history of the MS and a recension of the Panegyricus (fasc. XXIV of the Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, and the present article (to be continued) is devoted to the Euagoras, Helen, and Philip.

8. Pp. 129-35. Epigraphic Notes, by J. Delamarre. I. An inscription on a stone belonging to the ὄρος of a shrine to Ζεὺς Καταιβάτης, erected, like the *bidental*, where lightning had struck, confirming Etym. Mag. sub voc. Ἐνηλύσια. II. An inscription from Lemnos of some historical importance. III. A Greek inscription from Miletus relating to one Claudius Chionis, of the Roman empire (prob. about A. D. 200).

9. Pp. 136-8. Michel Bréal publishes an inscription from (ancient) Curubis, relating to P. Attius Varus, C. Considius Longus, and T. Tettius. It belongs to 49 B. C., doubles long vowels (*a* and *u*), and gives us a new word, *postecius* (*posticius*, acc. pl.).

10. P. 138. A. Cartault maintains that, in Lucr. II 8, *serena* belongs to *doctrina*.

11. Pp. 139 f. G. Lafaye proposes, Ov. Met. II 774, *ingemuit, vultuque minax* suspiria duxit.

12. Pp. 140-42. Éd. Tournier critically discusses Ov. Met. VIII 108-51.

13. P. 142. R. Pichon proposes *Casilini* for *Casini* in Liv. XXVII 23, 2.

14. P. 143. A. Cartault proposes *repudiemus* in Cic. Pro Arch. 19, and *praedicare*, *ibid.* 26.

15. Pp. 144-55. Latin Notes (continued from vol. XVII), by Paul Lejay. VII. *sonare* and *sonere*, VIII. *voto* and *veto*, IX. *vindex*, X. *invidentia* and *invidior*, XI. *temporum gante*, XII. Ov. Met. I 15 (read '*qua* refugit tellus, illuc et pontus et aer'). These notes merit attention.

16. Pp. 156-76. Book Notices. 1) G. Fougères, *La vie publique et privée des Grecs et des Romains*. Album contenant 885 gravures avec des sommaires et des légendes explicatives. Paris, 1894. B. H. describes this work, which he finds useful and attractive, but capable of improvement in some respects. 2) Eugen Pridik, *De Alexandri Magni epistularum commercio*, Berlin, 1893. B. Haussoullier pronounces this a very conscientious and useful work, but suggests several improvements, the most important being that the letters should be classified and arranged thus: I. Epigraphic, II. Authentic, III. Doubtful, IV. Spurious. The arrangement of the author is: I. Letters from Alexander, II. Letters to Alexander. Each of these groups contains as many subdivisions as there are classes of correspondents. The genuine, doubtful and spurious letters are mixed without distinction. Of course the character of each letter in this respect is stated in the accompanying remarks. 3) *Rhetores Graeci ex recognitione Leonardi Spengel*. Vol. I, pars 2. Edidit C. Hammer. Leipzig, 1894. A. Martin finds this work satisfactory in every respect, except that, as he shows by a number of illustrations, the author's collations of MSS contain not a few inaccuracies. 4) Friedrich Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*. Dritte Abtheilung, erster Abschnitt. Demosthenes. Zweite Aufl. Leipzig, 1893. Also: *Hyperidis Orationes sex cum ceterarum fragmentis* edidit Fr. Blass. Editio tertia. Leipzig, 1894. A. Martin considers the Demosthenes, of course, a decided improvement on the old edition. He discusses Blass's view of the genuineness of the first oration against Aristogeiton, and also his treatment of the question of rhythm. He describes the Hyperides, and highly commends both works. 5) *La Révolution oligarchique des Quatre-Cents à Athènes et ses causes*, par Horace Micheli, Genève, 1893. A. Martin briefly mentions this work, which shows acquaintance with, and ability to use, ancient sources, but betrays neglect of some recent works. 6) *Scholia in Aeschyli Persas* rec. O. Dähnhardt, Leipzig, 1894. P. C. makes brief but, on the whole, favorable mention, and notes the absence of an index.

7) The Hellenica of Xenophon, books I and II, edited with notes by R. W. Blake, Boston, 1894. P. C. finds the grammatical part of the commentary good, but the part pertaining to history, geography, etc., not so good. 8) Thucydides, book III, edited on the basis of the Classen-Steup edition by Ch. F. Smith, Boston, 1894. Very brief mention by P. C., who points out in the index several words erroneously called *ἀπὸ εἰρημίας* (most of them, however, found only in late authors). 9) Herodotos erklärt von H. Stein, III. Band, Buch V u. VI. 5. Auflage. Berlin, 1894.—Sophokles erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin, V. Bändchen, Elektra, IX. Auflage, besorgt von A. Nauck. Berlin, 1893. Favorably mentioned by P. C. 10) Velleius Paterculus, book II, chapters XLI–CXXXI, edited with introduction and notes by F. E. Rockwood, Boston, etc., 1893. R. Pichon pronounces this an excellent school edition. 11) M. Tulli Ciceronis pro T. Annio Milone ad iudices Oratio. Edited for schools and colleges by J. S. Reid. Cambridge, 1894. R. Pichon finds this an excellent school edition, which, in certain respects, is also a good scholarly work. He makes a few corrections. 12) C. Julii Caesaris Commentarii cum A. Hirtii aliorumque supplementis ex recensione Bernardi Kübleri. Vol. I. Commentarii de Bello Gallico. Editio maior. Lipsiae, 1893. G. Simonnet gives a tolerably full discussion of the critical apparatus of this edition, which, though a school-book, contains an account of the MSS. The reviewer regrets some omissions, and want of clearness in the method of presentation. Otherwise his estimate of the work seems to be high. 13) Flavii Josephi Opera edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese. Vol. III. Antiquitatum Judaicarum libri XI–XV. Berlin, 1892.—Editio minor t. II 1888, t. III 1892. A. J. gives an analysis of the critical apparatus, finds some minor faults, but otherwise commends the work. Vols. I, II and IV had already appeared. The minor edition receives brief but favorable mention. 14) Flavii Josephi De Judaeorum vetustate sive contra Apionem lib. II, editio minor, vol. V, 1889. This work of B. Niese is briefly described by A. J. 15) De bello Judaico libros VII ediderunt Justus a Destinon et Benedictus Niese, Berlin, 1894. Described and commended by A. J., who begins thus: “Ce qui précède était imprimé quand nous avons reçu ce VI<sup>e</sup> vol. qui nous offre la première édition critique, digne de ce nom depuis celle de Hawerkamp, de l’ouvrage connu sous le titre *de bello judaico*, conservé par les éditeurs, qui établissent très nettement que cet écrit fut publié du vivant de Vespasien.” 16) Franz Cumont, Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mythra, etc., Bruxelles, 1894 and 1895. B. H. describes and praises this work, and awaits its completion with impatience. 17) A. Schlemm, De fontibus Plutarchi commentationum de audiendis poetis et de fortuna, Göttingen, 1893. G. Rodier highly commends the part treating of the De Fortuna, but finds some doubtful conclusions in the rest of the work, though others are sound. 18) Scriptores physiognomonici Graeci et Latini, rec. Rich. Foerster. 2 voll. Leipzig, 1893. V. Friedel makes very appreciative mention of this work, which cost its author more than thirty years of severe toil. 19) T. Macci Plauti Asinaria, by J. H. Gray, Cambridge, 1894. Pronounced by Ch. Tailliart “a very good edition equally removed from too great conjectural boldness and too prudent reserve.” 20) Alfred von Gutschmid, Kleine Schriften, herausgegeben von Franz Rühl. T. V. Schriften zur römischen



und mittelalterlichen Geschichte und Literatur. Leipzig, 1894. Summarized by J. Laurent, who regards it as an important work. 21) *Iphigenie auf Tauris*, ed. Schöne, Köchly; revised by E. Bruhn (see Rev. d. Phil. XIX, p. 94). A. Martin replies to a complaint of Bruhn that injustice had been done him in the review of this work. It is a question of the propriety of Bruhn's having neglected Ziegler's critical edition. 22) *Esaias Lalin, De particularum comparativarum usu apud Terentium*, Norrœpiae, 1894. Pronounced by P. T. a conscientious and valuable work. 23) Paolo Bellezza, *Dei fonti e dell' autorità storica di C. Crispo Sallustio*, Milano, 1891. Ph. Fabia does not highly commend this prize essay ('crowned' by the Academy of Sciences and Letters of Milan), and adds that Bellezza has also published a work of no value on the sources of Tacitus. 24) R. Beer, *Handschriftenschatze Spaniens*, Wien, 1894. (Reprint from the Reports of Academy of Vienna.) Highly commended by Max Bonnet, who believes it will prove very useful to philologists.

### No. 3.

1. Pp. 177-9. An epigram on the battle of Actium, published, with comments, by F. G. Kenyon. The epigram was found on a piece of Egyptian papyrus. The writing belongs to the first half of the first century after Christ. Other writings on the same papyrus, in different hands but apparently of the same date, are dated between A. D. 5 and 15. The rare words *γηθαλέος*, *ἀδηνρις* and *πρυτάνευμα* occur in the epigram, which cannot have been composed before 27 B. C., as it contains the title *Σεβαστός*.

2. Pp. 180 f. H. Weil makes some critical remarks on the epigram just mentioned.

3. Pp. 182-7. H. Omont publishes two letters written by Claude de Saumaise to Jacques-Auguste de Thou about the Greek and Latin anthologies.

4. Pp. 188-96. A. Martin concludes his article begun on p. 123.

5. P. 196. L. Havet restores *meos* for *nostros* in Anthology (Riese), 445, 3, from a quotation made by Loup, who must have seen a MS with that reading.

6. Pp. 197-209. *De Aristotele primordiisque Comoediae Atticae*, Franciscus Susemihl. This article treats of, or touches on, the origin of the Attic comedy, the invention of the different parts, and the introduction of the third actor. It starts out with a discussion of Aristot. Poet. 3. 1448<sup>a</sup> 29 ff., 4. 1449<sup>a</sup> 9 ff., 5. 1449<sup>a</sup> 37 ff. The treatment is not very systematic, and the conclusions, which are not summed up, are a little vague, though the article as a whole is suggestive. The author takes issue with some of Zieliński's views, especially in regard to the double origin of the Attic comedy.

6. P. 209. Éd. Tournier emends Babr. CXI (134), 5-9; CXIII (136).

7. Pp. 210-13. G. Lafaye offers an ingenious explanation of Varro, *Rer. Rust.* II 5, 5 and Sat. frag. 257, 268 (Bücheler).

8. Pp. 214-17. R. Cagnat publishes an interesting inscription with *uncial* letters, belonging to the early part of the third century after Christ, and found at Timgad. He discusses this and other uncial inscriptions from the same place.

9. Pp. 218-31. Ph. Fabia investigates the third marriage of Nero. The discussion is divided into six sections, as follows: I. The offer of Nero to marry Antonia; her refusal and death. II. The family and lineage of Statilia Messalina. III. The date of her birth; her marriage with Vestinus and his death. IV. The date of her marriage with Nero. V. Her treatment by Nero: his 'harem,' and marriage with 'Sabina' (the eunuch, Sporus); his failure to honor Messalina as he had honored Poppaea. VI. Messalina's character; her pursuits after Nero's death; her relations to Otho.

10. Pp. 232-40. Book Notices. 1) P. Terenti Hautontimorumenos, with an introduction and notes by J. H. Gray, Cambridge, 1895. Ph. Fabia finds the commentary in the main good, but otherwise does not commend the work. 2) Antonius Baumstark, *Lucubrationes Syro-graecae*, Leipzig, 1894. F. Cu-mont describes this work with high praise, and points out its usefulness to Hellenists as well as Orientalists. He does not agree with the author in attributing certain Syriac versions to Sergius (the physician and priest who died A. D. 536). 3) Ludovico Macinai, *Omero, l'Iliade, canto I, con note italiane*, Roma, 1894. J. Petitjean considers this a good book, capable of slight improvement here and there. 4) *Drei- und vierzeitige Längen bei Euripides*, von Dr. S. Reiter, Wien, 1893. (*Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akad. d. Wissensch. in Wien, Philos. Hist. Classe, Band CXXIX.*) P. Masqueray considers all the instances doubtful, where a long syllable corresponds to a trochee, and so does not accept the author's conclusions. He points out that when in strophe and antistrophe there is a correspondence even between a tribrach and trochee, a dactyl and a spondee, etc., we regularly find one of the two feet in a proper name. He concludes that it is *a priori* improbable that Eur. would have placed a triseme long in antithesis to a triseme dissyllabic foot. Still he thinks that in the cantica for actors (who were more skilled than the choreutae) such correspondence may possibly be found. 5) Theodor Kock, *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes. Erstes Bändchen, Die Wolken, 4. Aufg.* Berlin. *Viertes Bändchen, Die Vögel, 3. Aufg.* Noticed briefly by A. Martin, who expresses high appreciation of the important contributions of Kock to our knowledge of Greek comedy. He regrets, however, that the introductions were not more radically changed, especially in their tone, which is too florid. He commends Kock's decision not to introduce the analysis of Zieliński. 6) *Anthologia Graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea* edidit Hugo Stadtmueller. Vol. I. Leipzig, 1894. A. Martin highly praises this volume, but reserves final judgment of the whole work till it shall be completed. He discusses the question of the number of hands that worked on the Palatinus. The only objection he raises is that the author makes too many conjectures, some of them not to be considered. 7) *Anecdota Graeca theologica cum prolegomenis. Gennadii archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani dialogus Christiani cum Judaeo, sive refutatio erroris Judaici, etc. E cod. Bernensi DLXXXIX primum ed. et adnot. Albertus Jahnus.*—*Accedunt Analecta miscella theologica, etc., Lipsiae, 1893.* C. E. R., in a brief note, points out the great usefulness of this excellent work.

#### No. 4.

1. Pp. 241-54. Declension in the Attic inscriptions of the Empire, by Joseph Viteau. This article is a useful supplement to Meisterhans.

2. P. 254. Éd. Tournier emends Babrius, XC (107).

3. Pp. 255 f. Paul Le Breton discusses the origin of variants found on the margin of a copy of Plautus published by Aldus in 1522.

4. Pp. 257-64. Book Notices. 1) A. Bailly, *Dictionnaire grec-français rédigé avec le concours de M. E. Egger, à l'usage des lycées et des collèges*, Paris, 1895. B. Haussoullier highly commends this work (of 2200 pages) and points out a considerable number of minor errors. 2) J. Keelhoff accepts in the main the views expressed in 'extended' and 'remote' deliberatives in Greek, by W. G. Hale, Boston, 1894 (extract from the Transactions of the Am. Phil. Association). 3) L. Preller, *Griechische Mythologie*, vierte Aufl. bearbeitet von Carl Robert. Vol. I, part 2. Berlin, 1894. Commended by A. Martin. 4) *Musici scriptores Graeci, . . . recognovit Carolus Janus*, Leipzig, 1895. Briefly mentioned by C. E. R. 5) T. M. Plauti Stichus, edited with introduction and notes by C. A. M. Fennell, Cambridge, 1893. Briefly mentioned by J. Vendryès, who finds it a good edition. 6) *Ausgewählte Briefe von M. Tullius Cicero, erklärt von Friedrich Hofmann*. 1. Bändchen, 6. Aufl., besorgt von Karl Lehmann. Berlin, 1892. Highly praised in general by Philippe Fabia, who regrets the omission of some desirable features. 7) E. Le Blant, *Sur deux déclamations attribuées à Quintilien* (21 pp. in 4to), Paris, 1895. Briefly described by L. D. 8) *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter. Editio philologica, apparatu critico, commentario perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata, auctore Friderico Blass*. Göttingen, 1895. Joseph Viteau gives a short account of this work, which he highly commends, though he finds a few minor faults. 9) *Étude sur la Peregrinatio Silviae, . . . par le R. P. Dom Fernand Cabrol*, Paris, 1895. Summarized by Joseph Viteau. The *Peregrinatio Silviae* was discovered in 1885 at Arezzo by Gamurrini. It is the account of a visit made by a pious woman named Silvia to the 'Sacred Places' in Jerusalem, and is of great importance for Christian antiquities.

In this number the *Revue des Revues*, commenced in a previous number, is concluded.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

PHILOLOGUS, Vol. LI (1892).

I, pp. 1-13. O. Rossbach, *Zum ältesten Kriegswesen*, takes up two points in ancient warfare: first the large, oval prae-Carian shield described by Herodotos (I, 171), whose explanation has hitherto been misunderstood and disbelieved, but whose accuracy is now again vindicated, as it has been so often before—this time by the study of a representation of such a shield upon a silver cup discovered by Schliemann at Mykenai. In the second part of his article Rossbach enquires into the use and early disappearance of the chariot in Hellenic warfare.

P. 13. M. Petschenig emends passages in Ianuarius Nepotianus.

II, pp. 14-45 and XIV, pp. 212-30. G. F. Unger, *Tages-Anfang*, considers in detail each passage bearing upon this question, and defends his views, already expressed in Müller's *Handbuch* (vol. I, 1886), against Bilfinger, who

in his dissertation on the same subject (Stuttgart, 1881) had opposed them. It is expressly stated, says Unger, by the old writers that the day of 24 hours—that is, the calendar or civil day—of the Athenians began at sunset, and that of the Romans at midnight. For certain reasons, however, direct evidence of the fact is by no means as easily discovered as one might expect. The older and essential meaning of both *ἡμέρα* and *dies* is the light of day as opposed to the darkness of night. This use of the two words was so entirely in the ascendant throughout the lifetime of both languages that many writers never use the secondary meaning at all, except when they cannot avoid it. Even in periods of several days' duration only the intervals of light are counted, and many of the Roman writers shut out the nights altogether from their calculations. For this reason calendar dates—the surest evidence for the beginning of day—are entirely avoided by the majority of writers. The usage of the Greeks, until the author's addition of several more in his treatment of the subject (Müller's Handbuch), was supported by but a single example, from Homer. The Roman usage is expressly stated by Varro, Pliny, Censorinus and others. The Macedonian day began at sunrise.

P. 45. R. Marcellino emends Plotinus.

III, 46-64. G. Wentzel, *Mythographische Miscellen*. 2. Die Oinotropen bei Kallimachos, shows that while certain details of this story are doubtless due to his own invention, Ovid goes back for his authority to Lykophron and to the Aitia of Kallimachos. A detailed review is given of the various ramifications and contaminations of the legend with especial reference to the version of Ovid.

Pp. 64, 265, 283, 360; XXXVI, 519-29, 622, 669; XLVIII, 680-91 and 734. M. Petschenig emends various passages of Ammianus Marcellinus.

IV, 65-71. L. Bloch. Critical notes on the Homeric Hymn to Demeter.

V, 72-83. J. Sommerbrodt. On the value of the Vaticanus (87 V) of Lucian. This article seems to have been called out by a somewhat severe review of the author's work by Schwartz (B. P. W. 1890, No. 41). Sommerbrodt attempts to vindicate the position of the Vaticanus 87 V as a MS of value, though he recognizes and frankly acknowledges that anything like a clear-cut statement of the true relationship of the Lucian MSS is at present impossible. He thinks, however, that the following are facts beyond contradiction: The Vaticanus 87 V is not free from interpolations and imperfections. These it shares more or less with nearly all the other MSS of Lucian. In essential points, however, it agrees with those MSS which are of recognized value. Hence it may not be overlooked in our establishment of a Lucian text.

VI, 84-112 and XXVIII, 422-64. K. Buresch. Kritischer Brief (to Crusius) über die falschen Sibyllen.

VII, 113-36. H. Blümner. Kritisches und Exegetisches zu den Gedichten des Herondas.

Pp. 136 and 145. J. Mähly emends Euripides, Medea 1255 and 1314.

VIII, 137-45. J. Miller, Die Beziehungen der Vita Apollonii des Philostratos zur Pythagorassage, thinks that Philostratos used Apollonius' Vita of Pythagoras in his work.

IX, 146-50. R. Ellis, *Catulliana*, traces imitations of Catullus in the so-called *Obiurgatio amatoris puerorum* recently published by Werner from Cod. Turicensis (12th century). The discovery is of especial interest in showing that perhaps some one between the 10th and 12th centuries had a copy of Catullus before him. This would help to bridge the long gap of silence between Ratherius and the appearance of the archetype of our present MSS of Catullus.

X, 151-5. E. Klebs. *Eine antike Benutzung des Curtius Rufus*. The absolute silence of the ancient writers with regard to Quintus Curtius is a well-known fact of literary history. Traces of his influence cannot be pointed out with certainty, though one passage in Seneca (Epist. 59, 12 = Curtius 8, 10, 27) to which Wiedemann (Phil. 30, 347) drew attention is possibly an evidence that he had seen the work of his contemporary. Klebs thinks that Hegesippus was evidently influenced by Curtius 9, 4, 27 ff. in his recapitulation of the story told there.

XI, 156-71. M. Manitius, *Beiträge zur Geschichte röm. Dichter im Mittelalter*, continues his article of vol. 50, p. 334 ff., taking up the Anthol. Lat., the *Disticha Catonis* and Aemilius Macer. Citations from Macer have no independent value, as they are all derived from Isidore and the Grammarians.

*Miscellen:*

Pp. 172-5. R. Peppmüller emends Kallinos 1, 15 and Semonides Amorg. 7, 45.

Pp. 175-7. E. Graf emends Aisch. Supp. 197 ff.

Pp. 177-80. E. Wendling argues for the Greek origin of the proverb (Herond. 3, 75) which Seneca, *Apocol.* 5, 74, gives as: "Ubi mures ferrum rodunt," i. e. where there is nothing to eat.

Pp. 180-82. M. Schneider. *Coniecturarum trias in Naumachii Epirotæ Medici fragmenta*.

Pp. 182-4. W. R. Paton. *Ad Iamblichi de Vita Pythagorica librum*.

Pp. 184-5. O. Edler emends Tac. Hist. 4, 53.

Pp. 186-8. O. E. Schmidt. "P. Bagiennus." This man, whom Gardthausen (*Augustus und seine Zeit*, I 1, 102) makes the lieutenant of Antony, appears but once in Latin literature (Cic. Ep. 10, 33, 4). M has *et pupilli Bagienni unam* (sc. *legionem*). Schmidt suggests *et populi (popelli) Bagienni (Bagienorum) unam*, which was not, he says, an uncommon practice at this period and, moreover, is suggested in the following sentence.

Pp. 188-9. J. Haury emends Theophanes 1, 170, 24.

Pp. 189-91. M. Manitius. Gellius bei Vincenz von Beauvais. Additional references to those in his article, Phil. 48, 564 ff.

Pp. 191-2. M. Manitius. *Nachträge zu Solin.* Cp. Phil. 47, 562 ff.

XII, 193-7. C. von Holzinger. *Theokrit in Orchomenos*. The foundation for a supposed stay of the poet in Orchomenos is *Idyll.* 16, esp. 105-9 (Hicks and Christ). Holzinger combats this view, emphasizing the presence of Pindaric reminiscences and the fact that the piece closes with a reference to the Graces. The poem is in reality a 'Bettelgedicht,' although Theokritos is by no means a Prodomos or a Manuel Philes. Hence there is no proof of any sojourn of the poet at Orchomenos.

P. 197. J. Mähly emends Aristot. Pol. I, 3.

XIII, 198-211. O. E. Schmidt, P. Ventidius Bassus, traces the career of the famous muleteer-consul after the death of his patron Caesar, making the very plausible suggestion that the well-known parody "Sabinus ille," etc. (after Catull. 4), is not Vergilian, but a piece of political satire by some unknown poet, directed against Ventidius and his sudden rise to the consulship.

P. 230. W. Kroll. *Hermetica*.

XV, 231-46. F. Hanssen. *Das Enkomologische Metrum*.

P. 246. Th. Stangl emends Bell. Afr. 18.

XVI, 247-65. F. Polle emends several passages in Soph. *Philoktetes*.

XVII, 266-75. L. Cohn gives an account of the MSS of Philo in Oxford and Paris.

XVIII, 276-83. L. Holzapfel emends several passages in Plutarch.

XIX, 284-93. K. Praechter. *Skeptisches bei Lukian*. The intimate connection of some passages of Lucian with Sextus Empiricus has already been pointed out by Struve and Fritzsche. Praechter adds to the collection of the latter scholar several other passages from the *Hermotimos* and the *Parasite*, and in this article considers each in detail. The author opposes Fritzsche's view that the skepticism of the *Hermotimos* goes back to Menippos and through him to Timon of Phlius. The point of view in the *Hermotimos* is in reality opposed to that of the Cynic philosophy. Hence Praechter thinks that the skepticism of Lucian comes not from Menippos, but from some unknown author whose date, though it cannot be fixed with certainty, is not far from contemporaneous.

P. 293. 'R. J.' emends Arist. Pol. Ath. 73, 25.

XX, 294-315. Fr. Cauer. *Studien zu Theognis*. Continued from Phil. 50, 529 ff.

P. 315. O. Crusius emends Herondas, III 69.

XXI, 316-50. H. J. Heller. *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung der Taciteischen Werke*.

XXII, 351-4. P. Habel. Note on the meaning of *Bucranium*. The symbol appears twice on pontifical coins of Commodus (175 A. D.) and twice in the reign of Caracalla (197 A. D.). The author opposes Borghesi's view that this was a symbol of the *Sodales Augustales*. Habel shows that its presence upon these coins is simply due to a misunderstanding on the part of the designer. He saw the *Bucranium* every day among the sacred utensils, and thought that he might use it to produce a new type for the reverse of the pieces in question. As such it has no symbolic value.

XXIII, 355-60. B. Kindt. *Petronius and Lucan*. It is pointed out in this interesting article that in his poem on the Civil War so often discussed, Petronius is neither giving Lucan a lesson in the art of literary composition, nor calling attention to the luxury of the Romans as a cause of the war, a

point which Lucan had slighted; nor is he attempting a parody or a travesty of Lucan, though traces of it are here and there visible. Petronius' difference with Lucan is on the causes of the war which are recited at length in the first book of the *Pharsalia*. As such the poem of Petronius is not a fragment. It is, in fact, an apology for Caesar written by one of the *cohors amicorum* of Nero, a descendant of Caesar.

XXIV, 361-3. H. Deiter collates the fragmentary Liber de remediis fortuitorum contained in the Amsterdam Codex No. 80.

XXV, 364-74. W. M. Lindsay. On the verse-accent of words like *facilius* in the poetry of the Republic. In this valuable article, which contains a full list of examples from the tragic and comic poets, Lindsay arrives at the following conclusions: The accent *facilius*—that is, of a quadrisyllable having the first three syllables short—is subject to no limitations. Of course, it is to be expected that such words should be found in most cases at the beginning of a trochaic or at the end of an iambic verse or hemistich. But while words beginning with a vowel often follow, the accent *facilius* does not rise from elision, nor from the necessities of metre, since many examples are found in other parts of the verse where elision does not occur. Cases of *facilius*, at least in Plautus, are very rare. Of 760 examples only 60 are exceptions to the rule *facilius* and a number of them are uncertain. When we take into consideration the instability of our MS tradition and the revisions and interpolations to which all the Plautine plays have been more or less subject, we have a right to believe that the poet's invariable rule was *facilius*. In Terence the usage is so little changed as to make Spengel's note to *Andria* 203 more than doubtful. The proportion in Terence is 22 *facilius*, some of them uncertain, to 200 *facilius*. The same rule is observed in the fragments of comedy and tragedy. *Facilius* does not appear to any extent until Phaedrus and Syrus. In Seneca it is still more common.

*Miscellen:*

Pp. 375-7. M. Schneider. Zur Batrachomyomachie.

Pp. 377-8. J. Hirschberg. Μαγειρικῶς in the Knights of Aristophanes (375-81). In explaining this passage Kock says that after killing the pig, its tongue was pulled out, the object being to discover whether it had measles or not. The scholiast also says μετὰ τὸ ἀποσφάζαι. As Hirschberg remarks, the context of this passage clearly implies that the pig was alive at the time the operation was performed. It is expressly stated by Aristotle (H. A. 8, 21) and Rufus (Oribas. Coll. Med. 4, 2) that one method of diagnosis for measles in pork was by examination of the pig's tongue while yet alive. Hirschberg is told by the director of the board of inspectors of the shambles at Berlin that the process is still known and practised throughout Germany, where it has the name of *werfen*, although, in the interests of humanity, it is now prevented in the cities. He adds that the process is not due to superstition, but has a genuine practical value, at least in cases where the disease is well advanced.

Pp. 379-80. K. Zacher contends for πασσακί instead of πάσσακι (Arist. Ach. 763), i. e. παν-σακ-εῖ, "mit allem Nachdruck, ganz und gar," and compares the tropic meaning of ῥοπή.

Pp. 380-81. H. Köstlin. Isagoras und Kleisthenes. Zu Herod. 5. 66, 6. 131.

Pp. 381-4. H. Mayer. Ueber eine Berliner Handschrift der Achilleis des Statius.

XXVI, 385-402. K. Tümpel. Die Muschel der Aphrodite. With plate. In this interesting article it is shown that the 'shell of Aphrodite' about which there has been so much discussion in the past is without doubt the Nautilus. The testimony of Archaeology is to the effect that the cult originated with the seafaring folk of Troizen, and thence probably spread to the northward. It is demonstrated that in her association with the Nautilus we have still another proof that Aphrodite is not of Oriental origin. But why was the Nautilus a symbol of the goddess of love and beauty? Tümpel's very plausible explanation is, in brief, as follows:

As patron of the Troizenians Aphrodite was essentially a goddess of the sea and patron of a people who were *par excellence* sailors. Her temples were usually set on headlands and other conspicuous sites. It was an ancient belief that before rough weather the Nautilus set his sails, but in fair weather furled them and resorted to his paddles. Hence these sailors of old looked upon him, as our sailors do upon 'Mother Carey's Chickens,' as portending fair weather or foul, and therefore naturally connected him with their patron-goddess. From this point of view the numerous representations of the Nautilus in ancient art, the figures of it used as amulets, etc., are readily explained.

XXVII, 403-21. L. Erhardt. Ilias B. An examination of the construction of the book. The contradictions in the first half are not due, the author thinks, to the unskilful patchwork of later times. The order of exposition was chosen in the first place for its effect upon the hearers. The catalogue of ships is a later addition. Nestor's speech (362 ff.) was designed as a transition to it.

XXIX, 465-73. L. Bornemann. Critical and exegetical notes on Pindar's 6th Pythian Ode.

XXX, 474-83. E. Rohde, Die Abfassungszeit des Platonischen Theaetet, again takes up the questions argued in vol. 50, p. 1 ff., and reiterates his former views.

P. 483. Th. Stangl emends Boethius, Cons. Phil. 85, 91.

XXXI, 454-88. C. Wernicke. Miscellanea Critica.

XXXII, 489-500. P. Natorp, the Aspasia of Aischines, reconstructs, as far as is possible, this work and discusses the doctrines advanced by the author.

P. 500. M. Petschenig emends Corippus.

XXXIII, 501-6. G. Sixt. Des Prudentius Abhängigkeit von Seneca und Lucan. The dependence of Prudentius upon these authors is not confined to echoes of phrase, vocabulary or construction, but extends to entire scenes and episodes. For instance, Seneca's description of the death of Hippolytus (Phaed. 1073 ff.) is the evident prototype of Prudentius' account of the death of the Christian martyr by the same name (Perist. 11, 85 ff.). So Cath. 9, 70 = Herc. Fur. 46 ff., etc. Naturally enough, Lucan's well-known fondness for



bloody scenes and frightful details of suffering make him a welcome model for a poet who undertook to describe the deaths of martyrs. Sixt gives a number of striking parallels. Appended to the article is a detailed list of single phrases in which imitation is evident.

XXXIV, 507-11. S. Linde. Coniectanea in Senecam Rhetorem. Cont. of article in vol. 50, p. 743.

P. 511. C. Radinger. Zu griech. Epigrammen.

XXXV, 512-18. O. Rossbach. Zu Ammian und den Codices Petrini. Emendations, closing with a catalogue of the contents of these MSS.

P. 518. V. Gardthausen criticises Schmidt's note on 'P. Bagiennus' (p. 186).

XXXVII, 530-35. M. Manitius, Beiträge zur Gesch. röm. Dichter im Mittelalter, continues his article of p. 156 ff., taking up Tibullus, Propertius, Semonius and Avianus.

XXXVIII, 536-40. O. Crusius emends Herondas.

*Miscellen:*

Pp. 541-4. K. Zacher. Zu Eurip. Alkestis.

Pp. 544-7. J. Lunák. Zu Eurip. Medea und Aristot. Rhet. II 14.

Pp. 547-8. J. Mähly. Zum Gnomologium Vaticanum.

Pp. 548-9. W. R. Paton. In Libanium.

Pp. 550-51. G. Friedrich. Konjekturen zu Plautus (Truc. 380, 485; Asin. 824; Curc. 16-18).

Pp. 552-3. H. Köstlin. Zu Ter. Eun. 347.

Pp. 553-8. M. Kiderlin. Zum XI. Buche des Quintilianus.

Pp. 558-9. W. Kroll. Zu den Inscript. christianae urbis Romae.

P. 560. O. Immisch draws attention to the identity of an old fable partially preserved in a fragment of Kallimachos (Schn. 93; cp. Phaed. I, Prol. 6; III 17), with one told in the Izdubar epos (Jeremias, Leipzig, 1891, p. 28, and Roscher's Lex. Myth., 'Izdubar,' p. 793). Immisch thinks it likely that this fable travelled eastward from Lydia rather than in the opposite direction.

XXXIX, 561-80. Th. Büttner-Wobst, Der Tod des Kaisers Iulian. Eine Quellenstudie, gives his verdict in favor of the account of Ammianus Marcellinus.

P. 580. Th. Stangl. Zu Columella.

XL, 581-4. J. Miller examines those traditions of Apollonius of Tyana as a *μάγος* that do not derive from the work of Philostratos.

XLI, 585-92. A. Scotland emends Odyssey, κ 174 ff.

P. 592. Th. Stangl emends Paneg. Lat. 10, 36.

XLII, 593-601. M. Schneider examines the connection of the hymns of Proklos with Nonnos as illustrated in their vocabulary and verse-technique.

XLIII, 602-22. J. Kaerst. Der Briefwechsel Alexanders des Grossen. Examines in detail such letters as are preserved in Plutarch's Life of Alexander, in Athenaios, etc., and concludes that none of them are genuine. The

collection of letters which Athenaios had before him and from which citations are preserved in Hesychios and Pollux was also used by Plutarch. In their contents they contradict the better tradition of Alexander's history. Kaerst concludes that the original collection was the work of some late rhetorician.

XLIV, 623-53. W. Schwarz. *Julianstudien*. Every man is the child of his time because he is the result of his training. If we can trace the psychological development of Julian as a result of these influences, we shall be able to discover why it was that a man who was intellectually head and shoulders above most of the emperors who come before and after him should have undertaken to destroy Christianity. A great influence upon his character was certainly derived from his studies, the extent and nature of which can best be learned from his own works. This is the point that Schwarz takes up in his article, discussing first, as a necessary preliminary, which of the works that come down to us under the name of Julian are genuine.

Owing to the fact that he wrote for the world at large and not for a small circle, and that he is scrupulous to give the authority for every quotation, we more easily discover not only the extent of his own reading, but the tastes of the reading public of his time. Homer was his favorite author, and to judge from frequency of quotation the *Iliad* was preferred to the *Odyssey*. Hesiod, though quoted with comparative infrequency, was carefully studied and much admired. Theognis was much read at the time. He is the only one of the elegiac poets whom Julian quotes, and that but once. The melic poets are not often mentioned. Of the tragic poets Euripides is of course the favorite; Aischylos is not named. So, too, the comic dramatists are rarely alluded to. It is a question whether Julian had ever read Menander, or, indeed, whether the works of Menander were at that time still in existence. He seems to have little sympathy with the historians. Among the orators Isocrates is set in the place of honor, though he is not quoted. Demosthenes, Julian thinks, was as great as a writer as he was little as a statesman.

With the emperor's turn for philosophy it is not surprising that after Homer the greatest influence—greater even than that of Euripides—should have been exerted by Plato. Julian admires Jamblichus, but perhaps does not overestimate him. Of contemporary writers no one had such an influence as Libanius. Naturally, the bible and the controversial writers were studied with great care and attention. Thukydides, Lysias and Isocrates, three writers who were much esteemed in his time, he does not quote at all. Others he cites from memory, and many more, of course, at second hand.

Julian has the most sympathy with philosophy, the least with the comic element in literature. Or to put it in another way, he cared least for the real and the actual. He was contemplative, with a high capacity of romantic idealization. There was no appeal to the fancy or the imagination in the dogmas of Christianity. This was one of the reasons why he turned away from it. It was only in his favorite classics that he found the food he craved. He was out of touch with his time and suffered accordingly.

P. 653. O. Crusius. *Ad Herondam*.

XLV, 654-63. H. Köstlin emends Thukydides.

P. 663. O. Crusius emends Eupolis, frag. 276 K.

XLVI, 664-9. W. Kroll. Zur Kritik des Q. Aurel. Symmachus.

XLVII, 670-79. P. Rosenstock thinks that the *Catholica* and *Instituta Artium* (Keil, G. L., vol. VII) have no connection whatever with the famous Probus of Berytus. The former belongs to the beginning of the third, the latter to the beginning of the fourth, century A. D. They are both forgeries in the name of Probus.

XLIX, 692-703. M. Krascheninnikoff opposes Zielinski's article in vol. 50, 'De sacrorum municipalium notione observat. epigraphicae.'

L, 704-19. M. Manitius, continuing his former articles, takes up the reminiscences of Lucan in the Middle Ages.

LI, 720-34. A. Chambalu. Flaviana.

*Miscellen:*

Pp. 735-8. O. Crusius. *Ταῖνος τις* als Mörder Iulians. Zu Liban. II, p. 31, 14 R.

Pp. 738-9. O. Crusius. Thongefässe auf Gräbern. Zu Properz 4 (5), 6, 73. See his article 'Keren' in Roscher's Lex. Myth., p. 1150.

Pp. 739-40. J. Lunák. Zur Medeasage.

Pp. 740-44. J. Zahlfleisch emends Aristot. Metaph., p. 1029 f.

Pp. 745-6. H. Lewy. Ueber einige Hesychglossen.

P. 746. G. Helmreich. Zum Anonymus *περὶ ὀφθαλμῶν*.

P. 747. H. Deiter. Zu Cicero, Pro Rosc. Am.

Pp. 747-50. R. Ehwald. Zu Arnobius und Cicero.

Pp. 751-2. H. Köstlin. Zu Q. Curtius Rufus.

Supplementband, VI (1891-93).

Pp. 1-109. Albert Müller. Die neueren Arbeiten auf dem Gebiete des griechischen Bühnenwesens. Eine kritische Uebersicht.

Pp. 110-61. F. Rudolph. Die Quellen und die Schriftstellerei des Athenaios. The entire work of Athenaios betrays the tastes of an antiquarian and a Stoic or a Neoplatonist. But the chief object of the compiler was linguistic. Large numbers of the extracts are given for the purpose of illustrating Attic idioms and words which in the second century A. D. were either obsolescent or quite unintelligible to the ordinary reader. The large proportion of quotations from the comedy is due to the fact that Athenaios desired to give an idea of the old Greek language of conversation. He cites 800 authors and the titles of over 1500 books, the most of which, but for him, would have been consigned to oblivion. The work is written in the 'Dissertationsstil.' Rudolph's primary object, however, in writing this article is, by a detailed examination of all the evidence bearing upon the question, to prove that as a whole the work of Athenaios is taken from the *Πανροδαπή Ἱστορία* of Favorinus and recast into the dialogue form. Rudolph had already advanced this theory (Leipzig, Stud. 1884, pp. 108-26), but it had received no adequate recognition.

Pp. 163-200. H. Lattmann. Die Tempora der lateinischen Modalitätsverba in Nebensätzen. A statistical review of the usage of these verbs in Cicero.

Pp. 201-324. O. Crusius, L. Cohn and E. Kurtz. *Zur handschriftlichen Ueberlieferung, Kritik und Quellenkunde der Paroemiographen*. Contains the following articles: Ein neuer Parallel-codex zum Miller'schen Athous (203-20), O. Crusius. Ein Londoner Exemplar der L-Klasse (221-3); Zur Ueberlieferung des alphabetischen Corpus (224-67), L. Cohn. Nachträgliches über Demon als Quelle der Paroemiographen (269-74); Aristophanes von Byzanz bei Zenobios und der Vers des Maison (275-80); Epicharm bei den Paroemiographen (281-94), and Zu der alexandrinischen Sprichwörterammlung (295-307), O. Crusius. Die Sprichwörter bei Eustathios von Thessalonike (307-24), E. Kurtz.

Pp. 325-94. E. Riess edits the interesting *Fragmenta Magica* of the so-called Nechepso and Petosiris. The work is accompanied by a brief introduction, by the testimonia and an index.

Pp. 395-9. H. Schiller, *Die Caesarausgabe des Hirtius*, opposes Hartel's view (*Comm. Woelffl.* 1891) that a complete edition of Caesar was issued by Aulus Hirtius. He thinks it very likely that Hirtius is the author of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, and that he published, together with its introduction, the eighth book of the *Bellum Gallicum* separately and under his own name.

Pp. 399-400. M. Petschenig. *Sprachliches zu Frontin's Strategemata*.

Pp. 401-500. F. Noack. *Der griechische Diktys*. In his introduction to *Diktys*, Septimius says that he translated the work from the Greek. It was Dunger's view (*Prg.*, Dresden, 1878), which, since then, has been universally accepted, that this Latin version of Septimius is the original work, the only authority used by all the Byzantine and Mediaeval writers who have treated the same subject; moreover, that Septimius' statement that his work was translated from an ancient Greek text is pure invention and designed to establish the credibility of his forgery.

In this long and interesting article Noack attacks Dunger's theory at all points, and attempts to show that Septimius told the truth. The source to which his book goes back was a narrative more complete and circumstantial. It went under the name of *Diktys* and was written in Greek. The Greek *Diktys* is, of course, now lost, but the substance of it comes down to us by two lines of transmission—on the one side by the Latin work of Septimius, on the other through the Byzantine Chronicle to the excerpts of Kedrenos and Malalas, who are followed in turn by the other Greek writers of a later age. The Latin *Diktys*-Septimius may be placed somewhere in the fourth century A. D. The Greek original is older, and the sources of it take us back to a period of respectable antiquity. The article is followed by an appendix on *Diktys* and John of Antioch.

Pp. 501-658. J. Marquart. *Die Assyriaka des Ktesias*. A detailed examination of the sources and influence of this work. Briefly stated, Marquart's conclusions are, substantially, as follows: Some portions of Ktesias' narrative were derived from trustworthy sources. Many other portions were doubtless folklore pure and simple. These he enlivened with the aid of Herodotos and Hellanikos, whom he remodelled to suit his fancy. He did not consult state papers or records of an official character. His principal authorities were the

courtiers of Parysatis. He borrowed freely from Hellanikos, but the loss of the latter's work makes it impossible for us to say how much.

Pp. 659-98. E. Klebs. *Petroniana*. Followed by two short articles: I. Die Municipalen Praetoren. The material is arranged under towns (Italy, Gallia Narbonensis, Spain), and is derived from the CIL.—II. Urbs, oppidum, civitas, patria. *Civitas* = *oppidum* entered into the literature from the common speech soon after Augustus, and became common before the end of the first century. *Colonia* and *municipium* fell into disuse when the real significance of the words ceased to be illustrated by the facts. In the second century *civitas* had taken the place of both.

Pp. 699-726. W. Soltau. Coelius und Polybios im 21. Buche des Livius. Livy's two chief authorities for the 21st book were Coelius and Claudius. As event succeeds event he chooses one or the other for his authority, as he feels disposed. Either he follows his chief authority exclusively or, when the two narrations are nearly identical, adds to the one some circumstance from the other. An example is the Coelian passage 21, 1-6, which is broken by the Polybian chapter 5. Livy's own part of the work consisted in a choice of authorities, a stylistic revision, the insertion of speeches wherever they were indicated in his original, and in the addition of a few critical remarks.

Pp. 727-66. E. Noeldechen. Die Quellen Tertullian's in seinem Buche von den Schauspielen. Ein Beitrag zum Verständniss der altchristlichen Flugschrift, finds that the authorities whom Tertullian cites most frequently are Calpurnius Piso, Varro, Suetonius, Vergil, Timaios and Stesichoros.

Pp. 767-77. G. Ihm. Die statistische Eigenart des VII. Buches von Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*. No definite conclusions are reached with regard to the probable history of the book.

KIRBY F. SMITH.